



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,733	07/31/2001	John Kroeker	57622-045 (ELZK-5)	2704

7590 02/06/2006

Toby H. KUSMER
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

AZAD, ABUL K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/918,733	Applicant(s) KROEKER ET AL.	
	Examiner ABUL K. AZAD	Art Unit 2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-13,26,28,29 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-13,26,33 and 2829 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on November 23, 2005.
2. Claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 are pending in this action. Claims 1, 5, 8-13, 26 and 29 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 14-25, 27, 30-32 and 34-36 have been canceled.
3. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. For examiner's response to the applicant's arguments or comments, see the detailed discussion in the Response to the Arguments section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
5. Claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As per independent claims 1, 26 and 28, the amendment includes limitation "speaker-independent speech recognition". However, the applicant does not describe in the specification whether the speech recognition is speaker-dependent or speaker-independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5-13, 26, 28, 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartosik et al. (US 6,725,194) in view of Papineni et al. (US 6,246,981).

As per claim 1, Bartosik teaches, "a speech recognition system comprising":

"a speech recognition device which receives an audio response from said respondent over a communication device and conduct a speech recognition analysis of said audio response to automatically produce a corresponding text response" (Fig. 1, elements 2, 42, 45);

"a storage device for storing said audio response as it is received by said speech recognition device" (Fig. 1, element 23).

"an accuracy determination device for automatically comparing said text response to a text set of expected responses and determining whether said text response corresponds to one of said expected responses, wherein if said accuracy determination device determines that said text response does not correspond to one of said expected responses within a predetermined accuracy confidence parameter, said accuracy determination device flags said audio response for further review by a human operator" (col. 6, lines 7-16 and col. 9, lines 1-62); and

“a human interface device for enabling said human operator to hear said audio response and review the corresponding text response for the flagged audio response to determine the actual text response for the flagged response, either by selecting from a predetermined list of text response or typing the actual text response if no such match exists in the predetermined list of responses” (col. 6, lines 27-54).

Bartosik does not explicitly teach, “a querying device for posing at least one query to a respondent” and communication device is a telephone. However, Papineni teaches, “a querying device for posing at least one query to a respondent” (Fig. 1, DM response) and communication device is a telephone (col. 14, lines 55-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Papineni’s teaching in the invention of Bartosik because Papineni teaches his invention provides a more versatile interface for interacting with users (col. 1, lines 9, 10).

As per claim 5, Bartosik teaches, “wherein said human interface device comprises a personal computer including a monitor for enabling the human operator to view said text response and an audio speaker device for enabling the operator to listen to said flagged audio response” (Fig. 1, elements 4 and 34).

As per claims 6 and 7, Bartosik does not explicitly teach, “wherein said querying device includes a program having an application file, said application file including code which causes the at least one query to be posed to the respondent, a list of expected responses and an address at which a file containing the received audio response will be stored in the storage device”. However, Papineni teaches, “wherein said querying

Art Unit: 2654

device includes a program having an application file, said application file including code which causes the at least one query to be posed to the respondent, a list of expected responses and an address at which a file containing the received audio response will be stored in the storage device" (col. 6, lines 51-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Papineni's teaching in the invention of Bartosik because Papineni teaches his invention provides a more versatile interface for interacting with users (col. 1, lines 9, 10).

As per claim 8 and 9, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said human interface device includes a graphical user interface on which the operator views said text set of expected responses wherein, after listening to said audio response, the human operator is able to select one of said expected responses from said text set of expected response if the operator determines that the response corresponds to one of said expected responses" (col. 6, lines 47-56).

As per claim 10 and 11, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said graphical user interface comprises an application navigation window for enabling the operator to navigate through said text set of expected responses, and an audio navigation window for enabling the operator to control playback of said audio response" (col. 6, lines 47-66).

As per claim 12 and 13, Bartosik teaches, "wherein said graphical user interface includes a text entry window which enables the operator to enter a text response if none of said expected responses from said text set of expected responses corresponds to said audio response" (col. 6, lines 17-36).

As per claims 26, 28, 29 and 33, they are interpreted and thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 5-13.

Response to Arguments

8. The applicant argues, "present system/method - where the respondent calls in over the phone, the speech recognition application is speaker-independent, and the system/method checks specific, short responses against a list of expected responses" is not taught by the references.

In response to the applicant's argument the examiner notes that Bartosik teaches respondent calls over a communication device (see col. 13, line 60 to col. 14, line 18) and it would be obvious at the time of the invention to use a telephone (see at claim rejection). Borrtosik teaches a speaker-independent speech recognition system and after correction it adjusted the coefficient of a particular speakers style of speaking (col. 2, lines 10-20).

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Abul K. Azad** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7599**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richemond Dorvil**, can be reached at **(571) 272-7602**.

Art Unit: 2654

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450


Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to: **(571) 273-8300**.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to **401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA-22314** (Customer Service Window).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 1, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A.K. Azad', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Abul K. Azad
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2654